The 'New world of Work' and innovative employee behaviour: a quantitative analysis.

Stan DE SPIEGELAERE
Researcher, Research Institute for Work and Society (HIVA), KU Leuven
Researcher at the ETUI (European Trade Union Institute), Brussels
Guy VAN GYES
Research manager, Research Institute for Work and Society (HIVA), KU Leuven
Jos BENDERS
Guest Professor, Centre of Sociological Research (CESO), KU Leuven
Geert VAN HOOTEGEM
Professor, Centre of Sociological Research (CESO), KU Leuven

Abstract:
Although the 'New World of Work' (Nouveau Monde du Travail - Het Nieuw Werken) is a popular topic in the current HR literature, empirical research on its effectiveness is lacking. This article studies the impact of this 'New World of Work' on the innovative work behaviour (IWB) of employees. We distinguish between four major principles of the New World of Work: (1) time- and place-independent work, (2) self-management work, (3) free access and circulation of knowledge and information and (4) flexible employment relations. Using survey data of 927 employees from five different sectors (banking, social sector, retail, hotels and restaurants and the chemical industry), we perform a multiple regression analysis to test which aspects of the New World of Work are related to the innovative behaviour of employees. The results show that the New World of Work principles have only a limited capability in explaining the innovative behaviour of employees. While working from home relates positively to IWB, this is not so for flexible working hours and autonomy over one's time schedule. The largest effects stem from the second principle 'self-management work'. Further, the analysis shows that flexible employment relations stand in very weak or even negative relation to the IWB.
Keywords: *'New World of Work'; Innovative Work Behaviour; Flexible Employment Relations*

Résumé:
Les « nouvelles formes de travail », connues en Belgique comme 'Nouveau Monde du Travail' (Het Nieuw Werken), sont devenues un sujet très populaire dans la littérature en Ressources humaines. Or il existe un manque de recherche empirique sur leur effectivité. Cet article étudie l'impact de ce Nouveau Monde du Travail sur le comportement innovant au travail (CIT) des salariés. Nous distinguons quatre principes propres au Nouveau Monde du Travail : (1) l'indépendance du travail par rapport au lieu et aux horaires, (2) l'autogestion du travail, (3) la liberté d'accès et de circulation du savoir et de l'information, et (4) des relations d'emploi flexibles. Sur base des données d'une enquête conduite auprès de 927 employés de cinq secteurs différents (banques, secteur associatif, commerce, secteur de l'horeca et industrie chimique), nous effectuons une analyse de régression multiple pour tester quels aspects du Nouveau Monde du Travail sont liés au comportement innovant des employés. Les résultats montrent que les principes du Nouveau Monde du Travail ont seulement une capacité limitée à expliquer le comportement innovant des employés. Alors qu'un lien positif apparaît entre le travail depuis chez soi et le CIT, il n'en est pas de même pour les horaires flexibles et l'autonomie sur le calendrier. Les effets plus significatifs proviennent du deuxième principe (autogestion du travail). Enfin, l'analyse montre que les relations d'emploi flexibles sont très peu ou même négativement liées au CIT.
Mots clefs: *Le Nouveau Monde du Travail, Comportement Innovant au Travail, Flexibilisation*

1. Introduction

In the Netherlands, and more recently in Belgium, a new concept is making sway: what we call the 'New world of work Work' (*Het Nieuwe Werken – Le Nouveau Monde Du Travail*). According to its partisans, the work organization and the employment relations should be rethought to match with the new technologies. The New world of Work (NWW) would result in mutual benefits for the employee and the organization. A more flexible work organization would contribute to a better work-life balance and eventually lead to more engaged employees. The organization on the other hand would benefit from a more engaged and cooperative workforce which would react swiftly to changes in the work organization (Bijl, 2009).

The implicit aim of the NW is not necessarily that employees work harder, but that they would work better and smarter. Flexibility and innovativeness are central in this conception. The enthusiasts of the NWW even believe that with the creation of win-win situations, the century old opposition between workers' and employers' interests can be overcome. Next to fans, the NWW also has its foes. As such, opponents mention that the NWW would lead to a blurring of the boundaries between private and work life and result in increased pressure on the employee. Further, as the NWW frequently means an increased use of teleworking and distance working, the communication and cooperation between colleagues would be negatively affected (Bijl, 2009; Dankbaar, 2010).

Notwithstanding the sometimes lively discussion between HR practitioners on the subject of the NWW, the academic debate is less lively. Only rarely, the NWW has been subject of research (Peters *et al*, 2011). In this article we aim to contribute to the academic discussion on the effectiveness of the NWW by studying one of the central aims of the NWW: making employees work smarter. The central research questions consequently are: 'do employees working in a NWW context work smarter? And what aspects of the NWW are the most important for employees to work smart?

The article starts with a description of what the NWW is, and how we can approach 'working smarter' using the concept of Innovative Work Behaviour. After an elaboration on the used data and method the results of the bivariate and multivariate analyses are presented. The article finishes with a discussion, a description of the study limitations and a conclusion.

2. The New world of Work & the innovative behaviour of employees

As with most social science concepts, a series of definitions and approaches exist regarding to the 'New world of Work'. In this article we use the conceptualization of Baane, Houtkamp & Knotter (2010) which identified four main principles of the NWW:

'Time- and place independent work': The first principle of the NWW refers to the stereotypical image of modern work practices. Employees are enabled to work from different locations and

on different time schedules. The traditional 'nine-to-five' idea is replaced by flexible work hours, autonomy over the time schedule and the opportunity to work from home or from different locations.

'Self-management': As employees are less present in the office, the management style needs to be adapted equally. From a control-style management, managers need to develop a more coaching style, result based approach. The focus on working hours should be replaced by a focus on work objectives. Therefore, employees need to take charge of their own work and cooperate with colleagues in teams.
'Free access and circulation of knowledge and information': In the NWW, the organization should be less hierarchically organized. The typical vertical flow of information should be supplemented with intensive horizontal communication between employees.

'Flexible employment relations': The last principle of the NWW refers to the so called 'adult employee relations'. The traditional 'one-size-fits-all' approach to employment relations (permanent, full-time contracts with a fixed wage) should be replaced by more tailored employment relations. This means an increased use of temporary contracts, part-time work and flexible forms of financial reward.

Obviously, the NWW is a very broad concept which encompasses both the work organization and the employment conditions of the employees. As Baane, Houtkamp & Knotter (2010) show, the NWW is mostly used as a management tool for implementing organizational change. Rarely, all principles of the NWW are implemented. More frequently organizations implement some of the principles of the NWW while sticking to old habits on other domains. This observation indicates a need for research on what actually works from the NWW. Which principles of the NWW actually contribute to stimulating employees to work smarter and which do not?

In order to study this question, we first need to explain our approach to 'working smarter'. In the context of this article we do this by referring to the concept of 'Innovative Work Behaviour' (IWB). IWB can be defined as "all employee behaviour directed at the generation, introduction and/or application (within a role, group or organization) of ideas, processes, products or procedures, new to the relevant unit of adoption that are meant to significantly benefit the relevant unit of adoption" (De Spiegelaere, Van Gyes, & Van Hootegem, 2012b).

Innovative Work Behaviour is thus so-called 'positive employee behaviour' as it is focused on contributing to the effective and efficient working of the organization. Research in various contexts showed that innovative work behaviour and ideas from employees contribute effectively to the sustained competitiveness of firms (e.g. Getz & Robinson, 2003). Innovative behaviour differs from employee creativity in two ways. First, employee creativity focuses on absolutely new ideas, while IWB refers to new ideas in a given context. Copying a best practice

from another department is innovative, but not creative. Second, IWB refers not only to the generation of the ideas, but also to the development of the idea into an applicable solution and to the actual implementation of the idea in the work context. In line with previous research we here distinguish between two main sub dimensions of IWB: idea generation and idea implementation (e.g. Yuan & Woodman, 2010).

3. Method

The relation between the NWW and IWB is studied using survey data of 927 employees from five different sectors in the Flemish region of Belgium. The selected sectors were the banking, retail, the social sector, hotels and restaurants and the chemical industry. The sample was drawn as a stratified random sample from the membership databases of the industrial unions belonging to the two largest Belgian union confederations: ABVV-FGTB and ACV-CSC[1]. The sample consisted of employees from a wide diversity of hierarchical ranks and occupational groups. We explicitly chose not to concentrate on a sample of a specific group of employees (e.g. knowledge workers) or from a specific context (e.g. manufacturing) in order to get a view of what works for a wide diversity of employees in different sectors.

The respondents were contacted by an interviewer and appointments were made for the face-to-face completion of standardized surveys at the respondents' residence. The response rate for the survey was 49%.

In the survey, different measures were used related to the different identified principles of the NWW. 'Time- and place independent work' is measured using three questions. First, the respondents were asked how frequently they could work from home (6 point scale running from 'always' over 'frequently' to 'never'). Next, the respondents were asked who determined their time schedule (themselves, in mutual consultation or by the employer) and whether they had a system of flexible starting and stopping times (fixed, flexible in certain limits or completely flexible).

'Self-management' was measured using two concepts. First the respondents were asked about the degree of autonomy they enjoyed in their workplace using seven statements (e.g. "I can choose how I perform the task"). The respondents could answer using a 7 point Likert scale going from 'completely agree' to 'completely disagree'. The reliability of the autonomy construct was high (Cronbach α = 0.85). Second, a question was asked whether the respondents were engaged in teamwork (dummy).

'Free access and circulation of knowledge and information' was measured using three constructs. A first construct referred to the communication and contact intensity between employees. This construct was based on 5 items (e.g. "I talk to colleagues from my department about the job", $\alpha = 0.70$). Next, the openness to complaint communication was measured using a three item construct (e.g. "In my organization, one can freely voice complaints", $\alpha = 0.84$). Third, a question was included on whether the employee had a frequent formal type of work meetings (dummy).

'Flexible employment relations' were measured using different questions on the type of reward and contractual policy of the respondents. As such, the respondent were asked whether they were subject to any kind of system of individual performance related pay (dummy), group based performance related pay (dummy) or profit sharing (dummy). Further, questions related to the contract of the employee (permanent vs. non-permanent) and the time regime (full-time vs. not full-time) were included.

'Innovative work behaviour' was measured using twelve items proposed by De Jong & Den Hartog (2010). Respondents answered these questions using a 7 point scale (always to never). Based on an explorative factor analysis, two dimensions were identified: idea generation (e.g. '*thinking actively about possible improvements*', $\alpha = 0.88$) and idea implementation (e.g. 'transform innovative ideas into useful applications, $\alpha = 0.94$).

Next to these, more questions were included as control variables. As such, we controlled for educational level, age, job type, industry, and company size. Educational level was measured as a categorical variable with four categories (ICED 0-1, ISCED 2-3, ISCED 4-5 and ISCED >5). Age and company size were measured as continuous variables and for job type, a four category variable was computed in line with the ESeC classification (Harrison & Rose, 2006 : 9) differentiating between (1) salariat, (2) intermediate professions, (3) lower white-collar employees and (4) lower technical blue-collar workers.

4. Results

4.1. Bivariate relations

Before the multiple regressions, several bivariate relations are examined. As expected, strong differences are observed in both the dependent and independent variables depending on the sector and the job level of the employee. Blue-collar workers are significantly less subject to flexible work time arrangements. Members of the staff, on the contrary, enjoy higher levels of autonomy over their work and have more communication opportunities with colleagues. In the bivariate analysis (see Table 1), working from home is significantly correlated with job autonomy ($r=0.25$). Employees who can frequently perform their work tasks from their house

experience a greater degree of discretion in performing their job.

The dependent variables (idea generation and idea implementation) are positively related with most variables referring to the NWW. As such, idea generation and implementation is positively related to working from home, job autonomy, teamwork, having frequent contact with co-workers, having frequent work meetings and effective complaint communication. ANOVA analysis (Table 2) for flexitime and flexible working schedules also showed that employees in flexible working time arrangements are generally more innovative in their work. For the variables referring to flexible employment relations, on the other hand, the situation is different. As such, the level of idea generation and implementation does not change depending on whether the employees have different kinds of flexible reward (individual, group based or profit sharing). When it comes to part-time work, the bivariate relation shows that employees working full-time have significantly higher scores in terms of idea generation and implementation then employees working only part-time. Last but not least, we found a (weak) negative relation between having a temporary contract and idea generation.

To sum up, the bivariate relations show that some of the aspects of the NWW are related to the innovative behaviour of employees while others are not, or are even negatively related to IWB. More specifically, all variables related to the flexible employment relations principle are not related, or are negatively related, to IWB.

[1] ACV-CSC is the acronym for the Christian Trade Union Confederation (*Confédération des syndicats chrétiens* in French, and *Algemeen Christelijk Vakverbond* in Dutch), first trade union in Belgium in terms of affiliation. ABVV-FGTB refers to the General Federation of Belgian Labor (*Féderation générale du travail de Belgique* in French, and *Algemeen Belgisch Vakverbond* in Dutch), which is the second trade union in Belgium in terms of affiliation.

Table 1 – Correlations

		cr a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Idea Generation	0.88												
2	Idea Implementation	0.94	0.77***											
3	Working from home	n.a.	0.31***	0.33***										
4	Autonomy	0.85	0.38***	0.33***	0.25***									
5	Teamwork (ref no)	n.a.	0.26***	0.28***	-0.17***	-0.06								
6	Contact	0.7	0.20***	0.18***	-0.06	0.02	0.22***							
7	Work meetings (ref. no)	n.a.	0.28***	0.23***	-0.19***	0.11***	0.29***	0.15***						
8	Complaint communication	0.84	0.19***	0.22***	-0.04	0.24***	-0.05	0.27***	0.16***					
9	Individual performance pay (ref. no)	n.a.	-0.06*	-0.01	-0.12***	-0.03	0.02	-0.04	0.18***	0.04				
10	Group based performance pay (ref. no)	n.a.	-0.03	0.01	-0.07**	0.02	0.09***	-0.06*	0.18***	0.03	0.52***			
11	Profit-sharing (ref. no)	n.a.	-0.05	-0.04	-0.01	0.05	0.07**	-0.06*	0.18***	-0.03	0.36***	0.41***		
12	Temporary (ref. permanent)	n.a.	-0.06*	-0.03	-0.07**	0.10***	0.01	-0.02	0.02	0.00	-0.09***	-0.07**	-0.08**	
13	Part time work (ref. full-time)	n.a.	-0.15***	-0.18***	-0.09***	-0.11***	-0.08**	0.05	-0.13***	0.01	-0.10***	-0.08**	-0.09***	-0.02
	Pearson Correlations, *: α < .1 **:α < .05, ***α < .01:													

Table 2 – ANOVA analysis

		Idea generation	Idea implementation
Flexitime	Fixed	-0,25	-0,24
	Flexible in certain limits	0,211	0,184
	Completely flexible	0,425	0,535
Anova p-value		<,0001	<,0001
Who determines the time schedule	Employee	0,347	0,381
	Employer	-0,19	-0,21
	In consultation	0,159	0,169
Anova p- value		<,0001	<,0001

4.2. Regression results

Using the SAS software, a stepwise multiple regression is performed. In a first step, the control variables are included; subsequently we included variables referring to the different principles of the NWW. After each step, the difference in explained variance is reported (Δ adj. R^2). We used the adjusted R^2 as it corrects the normal R^2 value for the fact that an additional parameter was included in the model. The reported estimates are those of the full model which include all variables of all NWW principles. The same regressions were applied for 'idea generation' and 'idea implementation' separately.

Table 3 displays the results of the stepwise multiple regression. The model is controlled for educational level, age, occupational level (ESeC), industry of activity and size of company. From the table we note that the principles of the New world of Work explain 15% of the variance of idea generation and 17% of idea implementation. These percentages are not very high, knowing that the control variables alone explain about 16% of the variance in idea generation and 13% of idea implementation. If we look only at the explained variance of the four separate principles of the NWW (Δ adj. R^2), we see that the bulk of the variance is explained by the second principle, self-management work (9% for idea generation and 8% for idea implementation). The first and third principles explain between 3 and 5% of the variance in our dependent variables. The fourth principle, flexible employment relations, explains only a marginal proportion of the variance.

Table 3 – Regression Results

	Idea generation			Idea implementation		
	Δ adj. R^2	β	p-value	Δ adj. R^2	β	p-value
Time- and place independent work	0,032			0,049		
Frequent homework		0,13	<0,01		0,18	<0,01
Flexitime						
Fixed		-0,03	0,85		-0,11	0,46
Flexible in certain limits		0,04	0,74		-0,12	0,38
Completely flexible		Ref.	Ref.		Ref.	Ref.
Who determines the time schedule						
Employee		-0,05	0,60		-0,01	0,92
Employer		-0,03	0,61		-0,10	0,17
In consultation		Ref.	Ref.		Ref.	Ref.
Self-management work	0,085			0,075		
Autonomy		0,25	<0,01		0,19	<0,01
Teamwork (ref. no)		0,23	<0,01		0,30	<0,01
Access and circulation of information	0,035			0,033		
Contact		0,13	<0,01		0,10	<0,01
Work meetings (ref. no)		0,22	<0,01		0,16	<0,01
Complaint communication		0,06	0,07		0,11	<0,01
Flexible employment relations	0,002			0,009		
Individual performance pay (ref. no)		0,07	0,41		-0,02	0,83
Group based performance pay (ref. no)		-0,05	0,58		-0,07	0,45
Profit-sharing (ref. no)		0,15	0,05		0,21	<0,01
Temporary work (ref. permanent)		-0,02	0,84		-0,01	0,91
Part time work (ref. full-time)		-0,10	0,09		-0,19	<0,01
This model was controlled for: educational level, age, occupational level (ESeC classification), industry of activity and company size.						

Next, we inspect the individual relations of the variables related to the different principles of the NWW. For the first principle, 'Time- and place independent work' we here included three variables. The first one, frequent home work is significantly positively related to both idea generation and idea implementation. It seems that employees, who are able to work from home frequently (controlling for all other factors included in the research) generate significantly more ideas and strive more for their implementation. For the two variables referring to the time schedule of employees, no significant relations were found[1]. In the previous section we nevertheless reported that flexitime and autonomy over the time schedule were positively related to idea generation and implementation. This positive relation is disappears when variables like job autonomy and working from home are introduced in the model. From this analysis we conclude that one of the two core 'new' ideas of the New world of Work (working from home) contributes to working smarter, while the other one (flexible, self-managed time schedules) does not.

As previously stated, the second principle related to 'self-management work' contributes the most to explaining the innovative behaviour of employees. Here, autonomy is strongly related to idea generation while teamwork is strongly related to idea implementation. These observations can be linked to the literature which showed that employees need a certain degree of discretion in their job to be able to experiment with different ways of performing their tasks (Ohly, Sonnentag, & Pluntke, 2006; Unsworth, Wall, & Carter, 2005). Moreover, a high degree of autonomy would also be related to a more flexible and broad job orientation of employees (Parker, Wall, & Jackson, 1997). As for teamwork, we can state that for idea implementation (which is a more collective endeavour then idea generation) a certain degree of collective discretion at work is needed. Employees who work in teams are much more able to communicate and implement their work-related ideas than employees who work in more hierarchical structures.

The three variables referring to the 'free access and circulation of knowledge and information' all have a significant effect on idea generation and idea implementation. Employees which have frequent opportunities to discuss work related problems with colleagues, or in work meetings, have significantly higher scores in terms of idea generation and idea implementation then employees who lack these opportunities. Further, the effective and free communication of complaints seems to play a more important role for idea implementation, than for idea generation. We can link these observations to the knowledge sharing literature which indeed states that the circulation and sharing of knowledge and information is a crucial antecedent for the innovation of services (Monica Hu, Horng, & Christine Sun, 2009).

At last, we inspect the variables related to the fourth NWW principle: 'flexible employment relations'. As previously mentioned, the proportion explained variance of these variables is relatively low. Yet, some of the individual variables are significantly related to IWB. Profit-sharing is positively related to both idea generation and idea implementation. Contrary to this, individual performance related pay shows no significant relation. This observation stands in direct contrast to the attention that is mostly focused on individual forms of flexible reward, and not on collective forms of performance pay. We can further link this observation to the year-old case study based research on the 'Scanlon Plan'. This literature states that for the effective mobilization of employee ideas, one needs to implement a system of collective profit (or gain) sharing and provide the individual employee with an effective influence on the organizational work (Massoud, Daily, & Bishop, 2008; Thierry, 2011; Welbourne & Mejia, 1995; Wren, 2009).

We further observe that full-time working employees score higher in terms of idea implementation than part-time workers. Part-time working employees could lack the sufficient tacit knowledge, time and resources to take initiative on implementing new ideas, yet this should be subject of further research. At last, in our analysis there are no observed differences in terms of innovative behaviour when it comes to permanent or temporary employees.

5. Strengths and limitations

Before discussing some implications of the study, we focus on the strengths and limitations of this research. The major strength of this research is that it is one of the first studies in managerial literature that focuses on the popular topic of the NWW. It does so by focusing on the four identified principles of the NWW simultaneously, which enables us to evaluate the relative importance of the different principles.

Regarding the limitations of the study, we first refer to the cross-sectional character of the data. Consequently, we can establish relations but cannot determine the direction of causality between the variables. Second, this study included some variables regarding job design (autonomy), but only included main effects in the model. We nevertheless know that the relation job design and employee outcomes is characterized by complex interaction effects of different kinds (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; De Spiegelaere, Van Gyes, & Van Hootegem, 2012a; Karasek & Theorell, 1990). The same goes for the relation between flexible reward and employee innovativeness (Baer, Oldham, & Cummings, 2003). Further research could go beyond the study of the simple main effects and look at the 'system' and 'unique combination' of different New world of Work characteristics, and their effect on employee outcomes (vb. Kauhanen, 2009; Laursen & Foss, 2003). Third, the study tries to operationalize the NWW by including variables related to the different principles of the NWW. Some variables are nevertheless imperfect proxies and better fitting variables could be included.

6. Discussion

After the analyses of the data, some discussion topics became obvious. First, we saw that all the NWW variables account for less than 20% of the variance of our dependent variables. This shows that the four identified NWW principles are by themselves not strong predictors for the 'smart working' of employees.

Second, our main research question (do employees working in a NWW context work smarter?) seems to have a rather complex answer. Some aspects of the NWW are shown to effectively relate to 'working smart' or innovative work behaviour of employees. We here refer to autonomy, teamwork, effective communication, regular formal work meetings and working from home. This last aspect, working from home, is one of the core aspects of the NWW which distinguishes the NWW from more traditional approaches of job enrichment and reorganization. The other focal subject of the NWW, flexible working time arrangements, is not related to working smarter. Flexible employment relations are not or even sometimes negatively related to innovative work behaviour. From our study, it seems that the four identified principles of the NWW are not all contributing to working smart.

Based on this observation we can question the ambition of the NWW to promote 'smart working' by modernizing the work organization and the employment relation. Our analysis suggests that the flexibilisation of the employment relation will not contribute to 'working smarter', moreover, it could have detrimental effects (like it has been observed with part-time workers). This empirical observation thus confirms the idea that innovation and the flexibilisation of the employment relation are not complementary strategies (De Spiegelaere, Van Gyes, & Van Hootegem, 2013).

These results have implications for the management practice. Firstly, the analysis suggests that in order to stimulate 'smart working', an exclusive focus on the principles of the NWW is absolutely insufficient. Secondly, our results show that 'self-management work' with autonomy and teamwork are main triggers for smart working (Delarue, 2009; Van Hootegem *et al*, 2008). Thirdly, the favourite focus of the NWW on working from home and flexible time arrangements is only partly justified. Where working from home seems to contribute to working smarter, flexible time arrangements do not significantly contribute to employee innovative behaviour. From this study, we can conclude that 'smart working' is primarily triggered by the work organization (teamwork, autonomy, working from home, communication) and less so by the work and employment conditions (working time, flexible employment relations).

7. Conclusion

Notwithstanding the wide interest in the 'New world of Work' (*Het Nieuwe Werken, Le Nouveau Monde du travail)* from the side of HR managers, empirical research into the effects is not widespread. Does the New world of Work deliver in its objective to make employees work smarter instead of harder? In this study we focused on this question. In doing so, we used the conceptualisation of Baane et al. (2010) who distinguish between four major principles of the New world of Work: (1) Time- and place independent work, (2) Self-management work, (3) Free access and circulation of knowledge and information and (4) Flexible employment relations.

The results show that the New world of Work principles have only a limited capability in explaining the innovative behaviour of employees. Contrary to the popular expectation that this new approach to work is revolutionary and will drastically change the employees' approaches to their job, such revolutionary effects were not found in the analysis. Moreover, the largest effects stem from the second principle of the New world of Work, namely the self-management of employees. This principle is not the main novelty of the New world of Work framework. Their attention is mostly focused on time- and place independent work. These factors such as flexible working hours, autonomy over working hours or working from home, only have a limited effect on the innovative behaviour of workers. In fact, only working from

home seems to significantly relate to how innovative are employees in doing their job. Flexible working hours and autonomy over the time schedule are not related to innovative work behaviour in any way. This finding put important question marks to the empirical validity of the New world of Work framework.

Flexible employment relations (the fourth principle of the New world of Work) has a minor impact on the innovative behaviour of employees. Some aspects of such flexible employment relations (like part-time work) are even negatively related to innovative work behaviour.

Taken together, the results of this study suggest that the positive discourse on the New world of Work and the blessings of time- and place independent work or flexible employment relations should be critically assessed. It seems that much more than tinkering with employment conditions, the key to improving employee behaviour is to change the work organisation and the degree of control employees have over how they approach their job tasks. This study thus confirms the year-old insight of Herzberg (1966): "If you want people to do a good job, give them a good job to do".

References

Baane R., Houtkamp P., & Knotter M., 2010, *Het nieuwe werken ontrafeld*, Assen, Uitgeverij Van Gorcum.

Baer M., Oldham G. R., & Cummings, A., 2003, "Rewarding creativity: when does it really matter?", *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(4-5), pp. 569–586.

Bakker A. B. & Demerouti E., 2007, "The job demands-resources model: State of the art", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*(3), pp. 309–328.

Bijl D., 2009, *Aan de slag met het Nieuwe Werken*, Zeewolde, Par CC.

Dankbaar B., 2010, "Inleiding op Het Nieuwe Werken: Trends en tegenstrijdigheden" in Verbruggen-Letty H. & Thunnissen M. (Eds.), *Het Nieuwe Werken, van dromen... naar doen!*, Rotterdam, NCSI, pp. 46–53.

De Jong J., & Den Hartog D., 2010, "Measuring Innovative Work Behaviour", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *19*(1), pp. 23–36.

De Spiegelaere S., Van Gyes G. & Van Hootegem G., 2012a, "Job Design and Innovative Work Behavior: One size fits all? Differences between white- and blue-collar employees", *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, *8*(4), pp. 5–20.

De Spiegelaere S., Van Gyes G., & Van Hootegem G., 2012b, "Mainstreaming Innovation in Europe: Findings on employee innovation and workplace learning from Belgium", *Lifelong Learning in Europe*, *17*(4), Available at: http://www.lline.fi/en/article/research/stan/mainstreaming-innovation-in-europe-findings-on-employee-innovation-and-workplace-learning-from-belgium.

De Spiegelaere S., Van Gyes G., & Van Hootegem G., 2014, "Labour flexibility and innovation,

complementary or concurrent strategies? A review of the literature", *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, *35*(4), 653–666.

Delarue A., 2009, *Teamwerk: de stress getemd?: een onderzoek naar het effect van organisatieontwerp en teamwerk op het welbevinden van werknemers*, Leuven, ACCO.

Getz I., & Robinson A. G., 2003, "Innovate or Die: Is that a Fact?", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *12*(3), pp. 130–136.

Harrison E., & Rose D., 2006, *The European Socio-economic Classification (ESeC) User Guide*, Colchester, University of Essex.

Herzberg F., 1966, *Work and the Nature of Man*, Cleveland, World Publishing.

Karasek R., & Theorell T., 1990, *Healthy Work. Stress, Productivity, and the Reconstruction of Working Life*, New York, Basic Books.

Kauhanen A., 2009, "The Incidence of High-Performance Work Systems: Evidence from a Nationally Representative Employee Survey", *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, *30*(3), pp. 454–480.

Laursen K. & Foss N. J., 2003, "New human resource management practices, complementarities and the impact on innovation performance", *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, *27*(2), pp. 243–263.

Massoud J. A., Daily B. F. & Bishop J. W., 2008, "Reward for environmental performance: Using the Scanlon Plan as catalyst to green organisations", *International Journal of Environment, Workplace and Employment*, *4*(1), pp. 15–31.

Monica Hu M.-L., Horng J.-S. & Christine Sun Y.-H., 2009, "Hospitality teams: Knowledge sharing and service innovation performance", *Tourism Management*, *30*(1), pp. 41–50.

Ohly S., Sonnentag S., & Pluntke F., 2006, "Routinization, work characteristics and their relationships with creative and proactive behaviors", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *27*(3), pp. 257–279.

Parker S. K., Wall T. D. & Jackson P. R., 1997, "'That's Not My Job': Developing Flexible Employee Work Orientations", *Academy of Management Journal*, *40*(4), pp. 899–929.

Peters P., de Bruijn T., Bakker A. B. & van der Heijden B., 2011, "Plezier in Het Nieuwe Werken? Randvoorwaarden voor "Werkgerelateerde Flow" onder Nieuwe Arbeidscondities", *Tijdschrift Voor HRM*, *14*(1), pp. 31–47.

Thierry H., 2011, *Beter belonen in organisaties*, Assen, Van Gorcum.

Unsworth K., Wall T. D. & Carter A., 2005, "Creative Requirement", *Group & Organization Management*, *30*(5), pp. 541 –560.

Van Hootegem G., Van Amelsvoort P., Van Beek G. & Huys R., 2008, *Anders organiseren & beter werken. Handboek sociale innovatie en verandermanagement*, Leuven, Acco.

Welbourne T. M. & Mejia L. R. G., 1995, "Gainsharing: A Critical Review and a Future Research Agenda", *Journal of Management*, *21*(3), pp. 559–609.

Wren D., 2009, "Joseph N. Scanlon: the man and the plan", *Journal of Management History*, *15*(1), pp. 20–

37.

Yuan F. & Woodman R., 2010, "Innovative Behavior in the workplace: The role of performance and image outcome expectations", *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(2), pp. 323–342.

[1] It could be stated that these two ordinal variables are strongly related to each other. An employee who can decide autonomously about his working hours is very likely to enjoy a certain degree of flexibility on the daily start and stop hours. Therefore, the analysis was repeated with the elimination of one of the two variables. Also in these analyses, no significant relation could be established. We further composed a single variable from these two original variables, but also using this variable, no significant multivariate relation could be established with innovative work behaviour.